REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed August 06, 2008. Claims 4-12, 15-17, 19-31, 38-48, 60-64, 71-74 and 78-80 were pending in the present application. This Amendment amends claims 4-7, 9-10, 15-17, 21, 23, 26-27, 29-31, 38, 40-41, 43- 45, 47, 60-61, 71, 73, and 78-80 and adds claims 81-86 leaving pending in the application claims 4-12, 15-17, 19-23, 26-31, 38-48, 60-64, and 71-74, 78-86. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 4-6, 78-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action alleges that the claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 4 as amended recites, 'a personalization system including a personalization engine' which has an enabling support in the description and thus claim 4 is believed to meet the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Claims 5-6 and 78-79 that depend from claim 4 are also believed to meet the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4-12, 78-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Beauchamp* US Patent No. 6,621,505 (hereinafter "Beauchamp").

Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that amended claim 4 is not rendered obvious by Beauchamp. Amended claim 4 recites one or more features that are not taught or suggested by Beauchamp. For example, claim 4, among other features, specifically recites:

> a personalization system including a personalization engine and operable to deliver a user profile interface to a client device of a user of the plurality of users, the user profile interface being operable to allow the user to modify personalization data for that user, the personalization data characterizing at least one functional property of at least one user interface element of the application user interface presented on the client device of that user

Applicants submit that Beauchamp does not teach or suggest the above-recited feature of claim 4. Beauchamp is related with method for development, implementation and maintenance of application-specific processes. The screens used for defining the processes are standardized screens that are presented by a universal client on the client computer in a common navigational framework. The steps of tasks of a process may be presented by the universal client 50 using a limited number of standardized screens in a common navigational framework. Once the user has learned the set of screens and navigational framework, the user may accomplish any process with almost no additional training. The universal client serves as a common user interface for all disparate systems and liberates the user from having to deal with multiple complex interfaces and confusing process flows. The standardized screens and navigational framework of the universal client allows users to experiences the same look and feel throughout all of their business process, regardless of which applications the process steps may involve. (col. 9, lines 1-20 and 25-30of Beauchamp). Further, even the navigation buttons included in the screens for navigating through the process are standardized navigation buttons. The header and footer (included in the screens) may provide a standard process navigation framework that allows the user to control process navigation. The standard navigation buttons that may be integrated into the footer of each screen allow the user to navigate forward or backward within the process. For example, Next and Back (Previous) buttons may provide functionality similar to that offered by a web browser. In addition, navigation menus may allow the user to jump to optional, previous, or subsequent steps in the process. (col. 10, lines 4-16 of Beauchamp).

Customization of the screens by the user will defy the purpose of Beauchamp of providing standardized screens and standard navigational framework. In Beauchamp the screens and the navigation buttons included in the screens are standardized such that they provide a uniform look and feel to the user throughout all of the business processes and reduce additional user training. Thus, the standardization of screens and navigation buttons in Beauchamp actually

teaches away from the customization or personalization of screens (application user interfaces) of claim 4. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Beauchamp does not render claim 4 obvious.

More specifically responding to the Beauchamp sections cited by the Examiner in the Final Office Action for this feature of claim 4, for example:

Figure 13 of Beauchamp describes the request and response between the universal client and the process server to execute a process. The universal client sends a request to the process server where the request may be related to launch of a new process or navigation (previous, next step) within an existing process. The process server then accesses the process database, any associated process or application data from a back-end database or application, generates an XML response that defines the requested screen and transmits this XML response to the universal client. The universal client parses this response to produce the screen and its contents for the user. This Figure only describes a navigation request (or new process request) being sent from the user to the server in response to which the server sends the XML response to define the screen. As discussed above, the screens of the process are standardized screens including a common navigational framework or standardized navigation buttons to navigate through the steps of the process. The user is only clicking on the navigation buttons to request a screen and is not personalizing any user interface elements on the screen by modifying a functional property of the user interface element. Thus, this Figure does not teach or suggest of any customization or personalization by the user (there is only a screen request from the user), more specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion that the user is able to modify personalization data that characterizes the functional property of the user interface elements of the application user interface presented to the user on the client device as recited in claim 4.

Figure 15 of Beauchamp describes relationships between objects used to define a process. A process developer designs a process to have one or more steps each step including one or more screens and each screen including one or more components. The designer specifies a business object to provide an interface to back-end systems and specifies custom data mappings which involve mapping data elements in business objects to the screens. For example, a TO-SCREEN type of mapping identifies the elements to appear on the client interface. The process designer may also specify adding user procedures which is a segment of code to be executed at a

particular time to provide functionality specific to the particular process being developed. This Figure of Beauchamp describes designing the process using one or more screens and as discussed above, these screens in Beauchamp used to define a process are standardized screens so as to liberate the user from having to deal with multiple complex interfaces allowing the user to experience the same look and feel throughout all business processes and thus reduce additional user training. Thus, any attempt to customize or personalize the screens of the process by a user will defy the purpose of Beauchamp and teach away from Beauchamp. Accordingly, Figure 15 of Beauchamp does not teach or suggest that the user is able to modify personalization data that characterizes the functional property of the user interface elements of the application user interface presented to the user on the client device as recited in claim 4.

Figures 3, 4 and 5 of Beauchamp each illustrate example embodiment of a screen framework rendered by a universal client. The screen framework is the basic shell for all screens and processes and the shell remains the same for different steps/screens of the process but its content in the work area (business process related work) 104 changes depending on the step. The screen framework may include header and footer elements which may essentially contain the same components for all screens. For example, the header may include, progress indicator, name of current process, etc and the footer may include navigation button, assign button, and other process flow control buttons such as pause, cancel, etc. In all of Figures 3, 4 and 5 of Beauchamp, the application-specific process is delivered as a series of screens, which as discussed above, are standardized screens that provide a uniform look and feel to the user and which incorporate common or standard navigation buttons that enable the user to navigate through the screens of the process. Thus, the screens are standard and the functionality of the navigational buttons is also standard. Further, in the work area 104 of Beauchamp the user performs various process-related activities, such as perform a specific step of the process in the work area 104 of Figures 3, 4 and 5. Although, in the work area 104 of Figures 3, 4 and 5 of Beauchamp the user can enter or modify some "data" such as, budget information, this "data" is business process related data and is not related to a functional property of a user interface element of the screen. Thus, this "data" of Beauchamp is not equivalent to the "personalization data" of claim 4 that characterizes at least one functional property of at least one user interface

element of the application user interface presented to the user on the client device and that is modifiable by the user.

Further, the user specified processes of Figure 3 of Beauchamp is associated with a pause button that provides the ability to stop current process and save it in a to do list and is associated with a cancel button that provides the ability to stop current process and discard all work. When the mouse moves over the pause button (or the cancel button) it displays a list of up to 10 user-specified processes. When the user selects one of the displayed processes the selected process is immediately started. Firstly, both the pause button and the cancel button are part of the screen footer of the standard navigation framework and both the buttons are standard buttons intended to function in a standard manner. Thus, any customization or personalization of these buttons by the user would defy the purpose of the standard navigation framework, also discussed above. Secondly, though, the list of processes is specifically for the user, the user is only making a selection from the list of processes and based on his selection a pre-defined screen of the selected process will be displayed. The user is not modifying any data that is related to a functional property of a user interface element of the screen. Similarly, the screen name of Figure 3 of Beauchamp is only being displayed indicating the name of the current process that the user is working with, there is no teaching or suggestion that the user is able to modify any data related to a functional property of a user interface element. Thus, none of these (user specified process, screen name of Figure 3 of Beauchamp) teach or suggest that the user is able to modify personalization data that characterizes the functional property of the user interface elements of the application user interface presented to the user on the client device as recited in claim 4.

Figure 14B step 462 of Beauchamp is associated with the "assign" button that allows a user to assign an existing process to another user to complete the remaining steps of the process. When the "assign" button is clicked a request is sent to the server for data for user/role list at step 458 of people to whom the process at that point may be assigned. The server processes the request and returns the list at 460, whereupon the client displays the list in the dialog box and the user selects at step 462 a particular user to whom the current process is to be assigned. Firstly, as discussed above, the assign button is part of the screen footer of the standard navigation framework having a standard function and thus, any customization or personalization of this

buttons by the user would defy the purpose of the standard navigation framework. Secondly, the in the dialog box displayed to the user on clicking the assign button, the user is simply making a selection from the list and based on his selection the process is re-assigned to the selected user. The user is not modifying any data that is related to the functional property of a user interface element on the screen. Further, the Previous, Next, Assign, Pause and Cancel buttons of Figure 14B are all standard navigation buttons of the standard navigation framework, which when clicked enable the user to navigate through the screens or pause/cancel/assign the process. The user is only clicking on the navigation buttons in response to which the navigation buttons function in their intended manner. The user is not modifying any data that is related to the functional property of a user interface element on the screen. Further, the User Input of Figure 14B of Beauchamp is the input that the process (server) expects from a user from clicking one of the navigation buttons of the standard navigational framework. For example, at step 240, the process waits for a user input from one of navigation buttons which are displayed on the screens (col. 25 lines 40-41). This user input (sent to the server) is associated with the user clicking on a navigation button, the user is not modifying any data here, and more specifically the user is not modifying any data that is related to the functional property of a user interface element on the screen. Thus, none of the above of Figure 14B of Beauchamp i.e., step 462, Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause and Cancel teach or suggest that the user is able to modify personalization data that characterizes the functional property of the user interface elements of the application user interface presented to the user on the client device as recited in claim 4.

Thus, in view of the comments above Applicants submit that Beauchamp does not teach or suggest at least the "modify personalization data" feature of claim 4, i.e., that is allowing the user to modify personalization data that characterizes the functional property of the user interface elements of the application user interface presented to the user on the client device.

The Office Action agrees that Beauchamp does not explicitly disclose the "user profile interface" feature of claim 4. On page 2, the Office Action states that, "Beauchamp does not explicitly disclose user profile interface being delivered, enabling user to modify personalization data for that user through the user profile interface." Further, the Office Action alleges that based on the personalized data (col. 21 lines 50-54; Customer Specific 604, Fig. 16; security profiles –

col. 18 lines 30-37) in the repository accessible by metadata and request, and delivering of response by a server to accommodate user's requests (Fig. 8, 13) as well as modifying of the delivered screen by modifying a property representing a GUI element as set forth above, it would have been obvious for one skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the user screen and repository system in Beauchamp, so that user interface being delivered would be for implementing profile-based application for the particular user, such that the property being personalized using said user profile interface could be modified and otherwise customized via the GUI elements. Applicants respectfully disagree for at least some of the reasons discussed below.

As discussed above, Beauchamp describes defining application-specific processes using standardized screens with a common navigational framework that allows the user to experience the same look and feel throughout all business processes and liberates the user from having to deal with multiple complex interfaces and thus reducing additional training. Based on this, in Beauchamp, the screen elements such as the navigation buttons, etc., have a standard functionality across all screens of all business processes and for all users so that once a user has learned a set of screens and navigational framework, the user can work with any process with no additional training. Thus, the purpose of Beauchamp in defining application-specific processes is to standardize the screens and provide a common navigational framework to the users. Allowing customization or personalization by a user would defy the purpose of Beauchamp and would teach away from Beauchamp. Accordingly, modifying Beauchamp to incorporate user personalization of the functionality of the user interface elements by delivering a user profile interface to the user to modify personalization data that characterizes the functionality of the user interface elements would render Beauchamp unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, that is, to provide standardized screens and navigational framework to the users.

Thus, Applicants submit that a prima facie case of obviousness has not established and claim 4 is not rendered obvious by Beauchamp.

In addition to the above, Applicants submit that Beauchamp does not teach or suggest several elements of claim 4. The Office Action agrees that Beauchamp does not teach or suggest the "user profile interface" feature of claim 4, additionally, the Applicants submit that

Beauchamp also does not teach the storage of personalized data and modifying of the delivered screen by modifying a property representing a GUI element as alleged in the Final Office Action on page 5, second paragraph, more specifically, Beauchamp does not teach the "modify personalization data" feature, i.e., "allow the user to modify personalization data for that user, the personalization data characterizing at least one functional property of at least one user interface element of the application user interface presented on the client device of that user" feature of claim 4. Thus, since Beauchamp does not teach modifying of personalization data it would not have been obvious for one skilled in the art to implement in Beauchamp the "user profile interface" feature of claim 4, i.e., the user screen and repository system, so that user interface being delivered would be for implementing profile-based application for the particular user.

For example, col. 21 lines 50-54 of Beauchamp describe a business object that may provide all of the data and behavior required to represent a customer such as address, contact information, invoice data, accounts receivable data, etc. This data is for a business object and includes customer contact information and other data related to the business process such as invoice data, etc and is usable during the execution of the business process. There is no indication here that this data characterizes a functional property of a user interface element included in application user interface and is modifiable by the user. Thus, this is not equivalent to the "personalization data" of claim 4 that characterizes a functional property of user interface element for a user and is modifiable by the user.

Figure 16 of Beauchamp describes different layers of metadata rules that may be employed to implement processes, for example, general operation rules 600 representing process rules for broad range of data processing activities, metadata for industry best practice rules 602 and customer or user specific rules 604 to sit on top of the industry specific rules. All these rules are used to solve enterprises' data processing needs. There is no teaching or suggestion of the customer specific rules 604 as including personalization data or being equivalent to personalization data that characterizes a functional property of user interface element for a user and is modifiable by the user as recited in claim 4.

Security profiles - Col. 18 lines 30-37 of Beauchamp describes enforcement of system security. Data sent across the network may be encrypted prior to transmission and the server may use user/role security profiles stored in the process database to ensure access controls and to maintain integrity of the data and system. This user/role security profile of Beauchamp, although associated with the user, is clearly security-related data and is not personalization data that characterizes a functional property of a user interface element for a user and is modifiable by the user as recited in claim 4. Moreover, this user security profile of Beauchamp is used for access control and maintaining data integrity and not for characterizing a functional property of a user interface element of a user interface displayed on the client device of the user as in claim 4.

Figure 8 of Beauchamp illustrates a process server and describes various components of the process server involved in receiving a process-related request from a client such as a Next navigation event and involved in responding to the request by accessing the process database. Figure 13 of Beauchamp as discussed above also describes the request-response between the server and the client associated with launching of a new process or navigating through the process such as in requesting (by client) and transmitting (by server) of a next step of the process. Thus, though, the server is able to accommodate user's request by delivering a response, the user's request is for a step of a process (by clicking on a navigation button) and the response from the server is an XML response that defines the screen of the requested step. As discussed above, the screens of the process are standardized screens including a common navigational framework or standardized navigation buttons to navigate through the steps of the process. There is no teaching or suggestion of any customization or personalization by the user, more specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion that the user is able to modify personalization data that characterizes the functional property of the user interface elements of the application user interface presented to the user on the client device as recited in claim 4.

As discussed above with respect to Figures 8, 13 and 14B, Next, Previous, Assign, Pause, Cancel, etc. are all standard navigation buttons of the standard navigation framework, which when clicked enable the user to navigate through the screens or pause/cancel/assign the process. The user is only clicking on the navigation buttons in response to which the navigation

buttons function in their intended manner. The user is not modifying any data that is related to the functional property of a user interface element on the screen.

Business transactions of individual data type spread-sheeting instances pertinent to one given user (vendor, weekly price: Figure 2; user calendar, Journee client: Figure 5; specified purposes...business objects: col. 6 lines 49-65 and col. 9 lines 31-35 of Beauchamp) in conjunction with profile data for that user are not sufficient for claim 4 to fall under the applicability contemplated by Beauchamp as is alleged in the Office Action on page 5 and 6. In Figure 2 of Beauchamp, the vendor database is a list of vendors selling products and the user accesses this database to search for product specifications. The weekly price sheet in Beauchamp provides pricing information of the products. None of these are personalization data characterizing at least one functional property of at least one user interface element of the application user interface presented to the user on the client device as in claim 4. The user calendar of Beauchamp is part of the footer of the standard navigation framework and appears to function in a standardized manner. The user calendar only allows the user to indicate on the calendar screen, his availability for accepting process assignments and does not allow the user to personalize any functional properties of any user interface elements on the screen. The business object of Beauchamp as discussed above with respect to column 21, provides data that includes address, contact information, invoice data, etc required to represent a customer and does not include any personalization data that characterizes a functional property of a user interface element. Col. 9 lines 31-35 of Beauchamp describe the universal client using which a user may identify a business goal and which also guides the user through the business-process related activities until the goal is accomplished. This has no relation to the "modify personalization data" feature of claim 4 and does not teach or suggest allowing a user to modify personalization data that characterizes at least one functional property of at least one user interface element of the application user interface presented to the user on the client device as in claim 4.

In light of the above comments, Applicants submit that claim 4 is not rendered obvious by Beauchamp and is allowable over Beauchamp.

Claims 5-12 and 78-79

Independent claim 7 is allowable over Beauchamp at least for a similar rationale as discussed above with respect to independent claim 4. Claims 5-6 and 78-79 that depend from independent claim 4 are allowable over Beauchamp at least for a similar rationale as discussed above with respect to independent claim 4. Claims 8-12 that depend from claim 7 are allowable over Beauchamp at least for a similar rationale as discussed above with respect to independent claim 7. The dependent claims are allowable for additional reasons.

For example, claim 78, as amended, recites:

> The system of claim 4, wherein the at least one user interface element is one of text, graphics, images, fields or buttons.

According to claim 78, the user interface element may one of text, graphics, images, buttons or fields and from base claim 4, personalization data characterizing a functional property of the user interface element is modifiable by the user, i.e., the user can modify data characterizing functional properties of user interface elements such as text, graphics, images, buttons or fields. Beauchamp does not teach or suggest such a feature.

Claim 79, as amended, recites:

> The system of claim 4, wherein the at least one functional property of the at least one user interface element includes one of keystroke functionality or functionality of the display buttons

According to claim 79 above, the functional property of the user interface element includes keystroke functionality or functionality of the display buttons, and from base claim 4, personalization data characterizing a functional property of the user interface element is modifiable by the user, i.e., the user can modify data characterizing keystroke functionality or functionality of the display buttons. This is supported in the specification on page 44, paragraphs 0104-0105 and Figures 12, 13A-13E, wherein keystroke functionality such as the tab-order, tab-over functionality associated with the tab key can be personalized by the user. Figure 13E of the specification illustrates an example user profile interface delivered to the user on the client

device as in base claim 4, wherein the user profile interface of Figure 13E enables the user to personalize a tab key functionality. Beauchamp does not teach or suggest such a feature.

New claim 81

Claim 81 depends from claim 4 and is allowable over Beauchamp at least for a similar rationale as discussed above with respect to independent claim 4. The dependent claim 81 is allowable for additional reasons.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 15-17, 19-23, 26-27, 29-31, 38-48, 60-64, 71-74 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Beauchamp* (US Patent No. 6,621,505). Applicants respectfully submit that *Beauchamp* does not disclose the features of these claims.

For example, Applicants' claim 15 as amended recites, among other features:

> an Internet application server operable to support an Internet application;
>
> an application user interface generator operable to generate the user interface for the Internet application for display on a client device of a user of a plurality of users, the user interface being generated using personalization data for the user of the plurality of users, the personalization data being modifiable by the user of the plurality of users wherein the personalization data characterizes at least one functional property of the user interface element of the user interface

Applicants submit that Beauchamp does not disclose at least the above-recited feature of claim 15, specifically; Beauchamp does not disclose that the user interface is generated using personalization data where the personalization data characterizes a functional property of the user interface element and is modifiable by the user.

More specifically responding to the Beauchamp sections cited by the Examiner in the Final Office Action for this feature of claim 15, for example:

The user specified processes of Figure 3 of Beauchamp as discussed above with respect to the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection, is associated with a pause button or cancel button and when the

mouse moves over the pause button (or the cancel button) it displays a list of up to 10 user-specified processes. Both the pause button and the cancel button are part of the screen footer of the standard navigation framework and both the buttons are standard buttons intended to function in a standard manner. There is no teaching or suggestion of any customization or personalization of these buttons by the user. Further, though, the list of processes is specifically for the user, the user is only making a selection from the list of processes and based on his selection a pre-defined screen of the selected process will be displayed on the client computer. The user is not modifying any data such as the personalization data of claim 15 that characterizes a functional property of a user interface element of the user interface and that is used to generate the user interface to be displayed on the client device.

Security profiles - Col. 18 lines 30-37 of Beauchamp as discussed above with respect to the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection describes enforcement of system security. This user/role security profile of Beauchamp, although associated with the user, is clearly security-related data and is not personalization data that characterizes a functional property of a user interface element for a user and is modifiable by the user as recited in claim 15. Moreover, this user security profile of Beauchamp is used for access control and maintaining data integrity and not for generating user interface for displaying on the client device of the user as in claim 15.

Col. 24 lines 18-30 of Beauchamp as discussed above with respect to Figure 13 of Beauchamp, describes the request and response between the universal client and the process server to execute a process. As discussed above, the screens of the process, delivered from the server as XML response, are standardized screens including a common navigational framework or standardized navigation buttons to navigate through the steps of the process. The user is only clicking on the navigation buttons to request a screen and is not personalizing any user interface elements on the screen by modifying a functional property of the user interface element. Thus, this Figure does not teach or suggest of any customization or personalization by the user (there is only a screen request from the user), more specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion that the user is able to modify any data such as the personalization data of claim 15 that characterizes a functional property of a user interface element of the user interface and that is used to generate the user interface to be displayed on the client device.

Figures 4-5 and col. 10 line 20 to col. 11 line 30 of Beauchamp as discussed above with respect to the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection illustrate embodiments of the screen framework presented by the universal client. The application-specific process is delivered as a series of screens to the user and the user may perform various process-related activities, such as perform a specific step of the process in the work area 104 of Figures 4 and 5, or navigate through the screens using the navigation buttons indicated in Figures 4 and 5. Firstly, the screens are standardized screens that provide a uniform look and feel to the user and which incorporate common or standard navigation buttons that enable the user to navigate through the screens of the process. There is no disclosure of any customization or personalization of user interface elements by the user. Further, though, in the work area 104 of Figures 4 and 5 of Beauchamp the user can enter or modify some "data" such as, budget information, this "data" is business process related data and is not related to a functional property of a user interface element of the screen. Thus, Figures 4-5 do not disclose that the user is able to modify any data such as the personalization data of claim 15 that characterizes a functional property of a user interface element of the user interface and that is used to generate the user interface to be displayed on the client device

Previous, Next, User Input, Assign, Pause and Cancel – Figure 14B of Beauchamp, as discussed above with respect to 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection, are all standard navigation buttons of the standard navigation framework, which when clicked enable the user to navigate through the screens or pause/cancel/assign the process. The user is only clicking on the navigation buttons in response to which the navigation buttons function in their intended manner. The user is not modifying any data that is related to the functional property of a user interface element on the screen, more specifically, there is no teaching or suggestion that the user is able to modify personalization data that characterizes a functional property of the user interface element and that is used to generate the user interface as recited in claim 15.

Thus, Applicants submit that the above sections of Beauchamp do not disclose that the user interface for display on a client device of a user is generated using personalization data for that user wherein the personalization data is modifiable by the user and characterizes at least one functional property of the user interface element of the user interface as recited in claim 15.

Additionally, claim 15 recites, among other features:

> the at least one functional property including an interaction model between the client device and the Internet application server, wherein the interaction model is associated with the timing of delivery, from the client device to the Internet application server, of data input on the user interface

Beauchamp does not disclose such a feature of claim 15 according to which a functional property of the user interface element that is modifiable by the user, includes an interaction model that is associated with the timing of delivery, from the client device to the Internet application server, of data input on the user interface.

In view of the above comments, Applicants submit that Beauchamp does not disclose one or more features of claim 15 and claim 15 is allowable over Beauchamp.

Claims 16-17, 19-23, 26-27, 29-31, 38-48, 60-64, 71-74 and 80

Independent claims 21, 29, 38, 41, 45, 60, 71 are allowable over Beauchamp at least for a similar rationale as discussed above with respect to claim 15. Claims 16-17, 19-20 that depend from claim 15, claims 22-23, 26-28 that depend from claim 21, claims 30-31 that depend from claim 29, claims 39-40 that depend from claim 38, claims 42-44 and 80 that depend from claim 41, claims 46-48 that depend from claim 45, claims 61-64 that depend from claim 60 and claims 72-74 that depend from claim 71 are allowable at least for a similar rationale as noted above with respect to the corresponding independent claims.

New claims 82-86

Claims 82 and 83 depend from claim 15 and are allowable over Beauchamp at least for a similar rationale as discussed above with respect to claim 15. Claim 84 depends from claim 29 and is allowable over Beauchamp at least for a similar rationale as discussed above with respect to claim 29. Claim 85 depends from claim 38 and is allowable over Beauchamp at least for a similar rationale as discussed above with respect to claim 38. Claim 86 depends from claim 60 and is allowable over Beauchamp at least for a similar rationale as discussed above with respect to claim 60. The dependent claims are allowable for additional reasons.

For example, claim 82 recites:

> The system of claims 15 wherein, a user profile interface delivered to the user on the client device enables the user to modify the personalization data.

Beauchamp does not disclose any user profile interface delivered to the user on the client device that enables the user to modify the personalization data.

V. Amendment to the Claims

Unless otherwise specified or addressed in the remarks section, amendments to the claims are made for purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof. The amendments are supported by the specification and do not add new matter.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

Jason D. Lohr Reg. 48,163
for Kim Kanzaki Reg. 37,652
Senior Patent Counsel, Oracle Corporation

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachment
JDL:PP:slh
61684923 v1